

## **REMARKS**

The above-identified Office Action dated January 8, 2008, contained a final rejection of claims 1-26 and 29-35. Claims 1, 11 and 21 have been amended in an effort to **clarify** claims 1, 11 and 21. Thus, the amendment to the claims clearly does **not** require a new search by the Examiner because the amendment to claims 1 and 11 deleted language and the new language added to amended claim 21 is for clarification purposes only. As such, the foregoing amendments to the claims and the remarks below are intended to place the case in condition for allowance, or alternately in better form for consideration on appeal under 37 CFR 1.116. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the amendments to claim 1 be entered despite the finality of the present rejection.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-26 and 29-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Satomi et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0039641) in view of Hoyle et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,010).

The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection based on the amendments to the claims and the arguments below.

Namely, the Applicant's independent claims include **automatically** presenting the advertisement to the customer **while the customer interacts with the interface with an input device** to generate the job ticket. In contrast, Satomi et al. in combination with Hoyle et al. are missing the features of the Applicant's independent. For instance, the cited references simply disclose adding advertisement information to a printed document (see Abstract of Satomi et al.) and a software application that includes targeted advertising based upon demographics and user interaction with the computer (see Abstract of Hoyle et al.).

Although Hoyle et al. disclose displaying advertisements on a user interface, the advertisements in Hoyle et al. are presented in "a display region used for banner advertising...when the user runs the program" (see Abstract of Hoyle et al.) and **not while the customer interacts with the interface with an input device** to generate a **job ticket**. In fact, nowhere in the combined references is there a disclosure that allows an advertisement to be presented to the customer while the user interacts with the input device to generate a job ticket.

Instead, Hoyle et al. disclose that “[B]anner advertising region 78 is an information display region in which is displayed graphical images comprising advertising stored locally on the computer” **specifically designed** to work with a “toolbar” software application (see FIG. 5 and col. 9, lines 27-40 of Hoyle et al.). This toolbar application in Hoyle et al. does **not** disclose allowing advertisements to be presented **while the customer interacts with the interface** with an input device to generate a **job ticket**, like the Applicant’s claimed invention. Therefore, when Satomi et al. is combined with Hoyle et al., the combination does **not** disclose, teach or suggest all of the features of any of the independent claims.

As such, since the Applicant’s claimed elements are not disclosed, taught or suggested by the combined references, the Applicant submits that the rejections should be withdrawn. *MPEP 2143*.

Last, with regard to the dependent claims, since they depend from the above-argued respective independent claims, they are therefore patentable on the same basis. (*MPEP* § 2143.03). Also, the other references cited by the Examiner also have been considered by the Applicant in requesting allowance of the dependant claims and none have been found to teach or suggest the Applicant’s claimed invention.

Thus, it is respectfully requested that all of the claims be allowed based on the amendments and arguments. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. Additionally, in an effort to further the prosecution of the subject application, the Applicants kindly **requests** the Examiner to telephone the Applicant’s attorney at **(818) 885-1575**.

Please note that all mail correspondence should continue to be directed to:

Hewlett Packard Company  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,  
Dated: March 9, 2009  
By  
/Edmond A. DeFrank/  
Edmond A. DeFrank, Reg. No. 37,814  
Attorney for Applicant  
(818) 885-1575 TEL; (818) 885-5750 FAX